Attorney Docket No. AUS920030374US1
Serial No. 10/645,200
Response to Office Action mailed December 11, 2006

III. REMARKS

1.   Objections to the Specification.

The examiner objected to the specification for "failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "computer usable medium" or "computer-usable medium." Claims 13 and 25 have been amended to replace "computer-usable medium" with "computer usable medium." The last paragraph of the specification (page 14, line 21 to page 14, line 5) has been amended to add the following:

> In addition, those skilled in the art will realize that the above described invention
> may be embodied in a computer program product stored on a computer usable
> medium.

2.   Claim Objections.

The examiner objected to claim 25 due to an informality. Applicant has amended claim 25 to change "a image" to –an image—.   Claim 25 has been amended to replace "a image" with "an image."

3.   Double Patenting.

The examiner provisionally rejected claims 1, 13, and 25 for double patenting over co-pending application 10/645,180. Applicant submits that claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended herein. In addition, the claims of co-pending application 10/645, 180 will be amended. Applicant believes that after the amendments in both applications have been entered, that the double patenting rejection will be moot.

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030374US1
Serial No. 10/645,200
Response to Office Action mailed December 11, 2006

4.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(e).   The examiner rejected claims 1, 6-9, 12-13, 18-21,

24-26, 31-34, and 37 as being anticipated by Tuli (US 6,941,382).

Tuli discloses a method of breaking up a web page image by first "translating it to a

black and white bit map or raster image." (Tuli, column 2, lines 22-30). The translation may also

be into "a raster or color image." (Tuli, column 2, line 32). In addition, Tuli discloses that "[t]he

image is divided after the bitmap or raster is created." (Tuli, column 2, lines 40-41).

In regard to claims 1, 6-7, 13, 18-19, 25, and 31-3, applicant's method breaks up a web

page image by calculating the number of x axis division and y axis divisions based on the pixels

in the image and directly divides the image based upon a calculation involving pixels. (See

Specification, page 8, line 3 to page 10, line 3). Therefore, applicant's method provides a

fragment of the original image at its original resolution on the hand held display device.

Applicant's method does not translate the image into a different image form (bit map or raster).

Applicant has amended the independent claims to clarify this distinction in two: first, the

number of fragments is determined by calculating a number of x axis divisions and a number of

y axis divisions based on pixels; and second, the image is divided into a plurality of fragments

without a translation into a bit map image or a raster image.

4.   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 3, 10-11, 15, 22-23,

28, and 35-36 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tuli.

Applicant submits that these claims now depend for allowable amended claims 1, 13 and

25. Moreover, applicant submits that the examiner's basis for suggesting the limitations to a

skilled artisan are removed by the amendments to claims 1, 13 and 25.

Page 11 of 12

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030374US1
Serial No. 10/645,200
Response to Office Action mailed December 11, 2006

5.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 16, 27, and 29 as

being unpatentable over Tuli in view of Microsoft Internet Explorer, hereinafter IE.

In regard to claims 2, 4, 16, 27, and 29, applicant submits that Tuli does not teach that the

Tuli fragment is displayed at the image's intended resolution because the image in Tuli has been

translated into a different image. Applicant further submits that the captured image of a Google

home page (IE) does not suggest combining displaying a web page at a reduced resolution in a

hand held device display, nor determining if the web page contains an image in a hand held

display device.

6.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 5, 17, and 30 as being

unpatentable over Tuli in view of Blumberg (US 6,886,034). Applicant submits that Blumberg

does not teach or suggest determining whether the web page contains an image for display in a

hand held display device.

5.   Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2650
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-461-4050
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com